REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Agarwal (International Patent Application No. WO 99/04521). Claims 1-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ahmadvand (U.S. Patent 6,542,490) in view of Long (U.S. Patent 5,805,822) and Cheng (U.S. Patent 6,226,301). Claims 3, 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Agarwal in view of Barrett (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,549).

Please cancel Claims 2 and 6 without prejudice.

It is respectfully submitted that the Submission, submitted in connection with the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed November 23, 2004, contained amendments to Claims 1 and 5, and also contained several arguments to distinguish the claims of the present application from the cited references. The Examiner has apparently not reviewed the amendments to Claims 1 and 5 that recites, "attaching, at each head of the consecutive frames, a header including a first set of bits indicating the sequence number of a consecutive block *to which a first sub-consecutive block is included* and a second set of bits indicating the sequence number of a sub-consecutive block". It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider the aforementioned amendments and remarks.

Further, several of the arguments set forth in the Submission were not addressed by the Examiner. Presented to the Examiner was that the present invention does not transmit a data block unit but transmits a data stream by segmenting the data stream into a plurality of frames. A header of each frame, which is a transmission unit, includes a block sequence number indicating a block number of a transmitted RLP frame and a sub-block sequence number indicating a first sub-block number in the transmitted RLP frame. In Agarwal et al. "PKTSEQNO" denotes a terminal packet segmentation sequence number of each packet; and, "SARID" is increased along with each subsequent segment. It is again submitted that the claims of the present application are distinguishable from Agarwal et al. in that in the reference, a unit for segmenting the data stream and a transmission unit are identical, but in the claims of the present application, the above two units are

different. Therefore, in the reference, a subsequence segment number (SARID) is inevitably increased at every transmitted block, while in the present invention, the RLP frames can have the same block sequence number, as shown in RLP frames C and D of Fig. 7. In addition, the sub-block sequence number of the reference indicates a segmented sequence. However, the data sequence number of the claims of the present application, which is included in a second set of bits of the RLP frame, indicates a number of a first sub-consecutive block of a corresponding RLP frame as shown in Fig. 7. Again, the RLP frames can have same data sequence number. However, in the reference, the subsequence segment number (SARID) *must* be a different number, i.e. is inevitably increased to thereby have different values.

Independent Claims 1 and 5 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 3, 4 and 7-9, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 3, 4 and 7-9 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7-9, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM/dr